

An isoperimetric inequality for antipodal subsets of the discrete cube

David Ellis* and Imre Leader†

21st September 2016

Abstract

A family of subsets of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ is said to be *antipodal* if it is closed under taking complements. We prove a best-possible isoperimetric inequality for antipodal families of subsets of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Our inequality implies that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, among all such families of size 2^k , a family consisting of the union of a $(k-1)$ -dimensional subcube and its antipode has the smallest possible edge boundary.

1 Introduction

Isoperimetric questions are classical objects of study in mathematics. In general, they ask for the minimum possible ‘boundary-size’ of a set of a given ‘size’, where the exact meaning of these words varies according to the problem.

The classical isoperimetric problem in the plane asks for the minimum possible perimeter of a shape in the plane with area 1. The answer, that it is best to take a circle, was ‘known’ to the ancient Greeks, but it was not until the 19th century that this was proved rigorously, by Weierstrass in a series of lectures in the 1870s in Berlin.

The isoperimetric problem has been solved for n -dimensional Euclidean space $\mathbb{E}^n$, for the n -dimensional unit sphere $\mathbb{S}^n := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} x_i^2 = 1\}$, and for n -dimensional hyperbolic space $\mathbb{H}^n$ (for all n), with the natural notion of boundary in each case, corresponding to surface area for sufficiently ‘nice’ sets. (For background on isoperimetric problems, we refer the reader to the book [2] of Burago and Zalgaller, the survey [6] of Osserman, the survey [8] of Ros, and the references therein.) One of the best-known open problems in the area is to solve the isoperimetric problem for n -dimensional real projective space $\mathbb{RP}^n$, or equivalently for antipodal subsets of the n -dimensional sphere $\mathbb{S}^n$ (where a

*School of Mathematical Sciences, Queen Mary, University of London, Mile End Road, London, E1 4NS, UK. Email: D.Ellis@qmul.ac.uk

†Department of Pure Mathematics and Mathematical Statistics, University of Cambridge, Centre for Mathematical Sciences, Wilberforce Road, Cambridge, CB3 0WA, UK. Email: I.Leader@dpms.cam.ac.uk

subset $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{S}^n$ is said to be *antipodal* if $\mathcal{A} = -\mathcal{A}$. The conjecture can be stated as follows.

Conjecture 1. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \geq 2$, and let μ denote the n -dimensional Hausdorff measure on $\mathbb{S}^n$. Let $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{S}^n$ be open and antipodal. Then there exists a set $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{S}^n$ such that $\mu(\mathcal{B}) = \mu(\mathcal{A})$, $\sigma(\mathcal{B}) \leq \sigma(\mathcal{A})$, and*

$$\mathcal{B} = \{x \in \mathbb{S}^n : \sum_{i=1}^r x_i^2 > a\}$$

for some $r \in [n]$ and some $a \in \mathbb{R}$.

Here, if $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{S}^n$ is an open set, then $\sigma(\mathcal{A})$ denotes the surface area of $\mathcal{A}$, i.e. the $(n-1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure of the topological boundary of $\mathcal{A}$.

Only the cases $n = 2$ and $n = 3$ of Conjecture 1 are known, the former being ‘folklore’ and the latter being due to Ritoré and Ros [7].

In this paper, we prove a discrete analogue of Conjecture 1. First, we recall some standard notation and definitions. If X is a set, we write $\mathcal{P}(X)$ for the power-set of X . For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we write $[n] := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, and we let Q_n denote the graph of the n -dimensional discrete cube, i.e. the graph with vertex-set $\mathcal{P}([n])$, where x and y are joined by an edge if $|x \Delta y| = 1$. If $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$, we write $\partial\mathcal{A}$ for the edge-boundary of $\mathcal{A}$ in the discrete cube Q_n , i.e. $\partial\mathcal{A}$ is the set of edges of Q_n which join a vertex in $\mathcal{A}$ to a vertex outside $\mathcal{A}$. We write $e(\mathcal{A})$ for the number of edges of Q_n which have both end-vertices in $\mathcal{A}$. We say that two families $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$ are *isomorphic* (and write $\mathcal{A} \cong \mathcal{B}$) if there exists an automorphism σ of Q_n such that $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{B}$.

The *binary ordering* on $\mathcal{P}([n])$ is defined by $x < y$ iff $\max(x \Delta y) \in y$. An *initial segment of the binary ordering* on $\mathcal{P}([n])$ is the set of the first k elements of $\mathcal{P}([n])$ in the binary ordering, for some $k \leq 2^n$.

Harper [3], Lindsay [5], Bernstein [1] and Hart [4] solved the edge isoperimetric problem for Q_n , showing that among all subsets of $\mathcal{P}([n])$ of fixed size, initial segments of the binary ordering on $\mathcal{P}([n])$ have the smallest possible edge-boundary. We consider the edge isoperimetric problem for antipodal sets in Q_n .

If $x \subset [n]$, we define $\bar{x} = [n] \setminus x$, and if $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$, we define the *antipode* of $\mathcal{A}$ by $\bar{\mathcal{A}} = \{\bar{x} : x \in \mathcal{A}\}$. A family $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$ is said to be *antipodal* if $\mathcal{A} = \bar{\mathcal{A}}$.

We prove the following edge isoperimetric inequality for antipodal sets.

Theorem 2. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$ be antipodal. Then $|\partial\mathcal{A}| \geq |\partial(\mathcal{B} \cup \bar{\mathcal{B}})|$, where $\mathcal{B}$ is the initial segment of the binary ordering on $\mathcal{P}([n])$ of size $|\mathcal{A}|/2$.*

Clearly, Theorem 2 is best-possible. It implies that if $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$ is antipodal with $|\mathcal{A}| = 2^k$ for some $k \in [n-1]$, then $|\partial\mathcal{A}| \geq |\partial(\mathcal{S}_{k-1} \cup \bar{\mathcal{S}}_{k-1})|$, where $\mathcal{S}_{k-1} = \{x \subset [n] : x \cap \{k, k+1, \dots, n\} = \emptyset\}$ is a $(k-1)$ -dimensional subcube. In other words, the union of a subcube and its antipode has the smallest possible edge-boundary, over all antipodal sets of the same size.

For the discussion which follows, it is helpful for us to rephrase Theorem 2 slightly. Observe that for any family $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$, we have

$$2e(\mathcal{A}) + |\partial\mathcal{A}| = n|\mathcal{A}|,$$

so Theorem 2 is equivalent to the statement that if $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$ is antipodal, then $e(\mathcal{A}) \leq e(\mathcal{B} \cup \overline{\mathcal{B}})$, where $\mathcal{B}$ is the initial segment of the binary ordering on $\mathcal{P}([n])$ of size $|\mathcal{A}|/2$. Let us say that a family $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$ is *good* if $\mathcal{A} \cong \mathcal{B} \cup \overline{\mathcal{B}}$, where $\mathcal{B}$ is the initial segment of the binary ordering on $\mathcal{P}([n])$ of size $|\mathcal{A}|/2$. It is easy to check that if $\mathcal{A}$ is good, then so is $\mathcal{A}^c$, so we may assume in proving Theorem 2 that $|\mathcal{A}| \leq 2^{n-1}$, by taking complements if necessary. Note that if $\mathcal{B}$ is an initial segment of the binary ordering on $\mathcal{P}([n])$ with $|\mathcal{B}| \leq 2^{n-2}$, then $\mathcal{B} \subset \{x \subset [n] : x \cap \{n-1, n\} = \emptyset\}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{B}} \subset \{x \subset [n] : \{n-1, n\} \subset x\}$, so $\mathcal{B} \cap \overline{\mathcal{B}} = \emptyset$ and $e(\mathcal{B}, \overline{\mathcal{B}}) = 0$; since $\overline{\mathcal{B}} \cong \mathcal{B}$, we have $e(\overline{\mathcal{B}}) = e(\mathcal{B})$, so

$$e(\mathcal{B} \cup \overline{\mathcal{B}}) = e(\mathcal{B}) + e(\overline{\mathcal{B}}) = 2e(\mathcal{B}).$$

If $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k \leq 2^n$, we define $F(k) = e(\mathcal{B})$, where $\mathcal{B}$ is the initial segment of the binary ordering on $\mathcal{P}([n])$ of size k . (It is easy to see that $F(k)$ is independent of n .) In terms of the function F , Theorem 2 is clearly equivalent to the following statement: for any antipodal family $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$ with $|\mathcal{A}| \leq 2^{n-1}$,

$$e(\mathcal{A}) \leq 2F(|\mathcal{A}|/2). \quad (1)$$

Now for a few words about our proof. In the special cases of $|\mathcal{A}| = 2^{n-1}$ and $|\mathcal{A}| = 2^{n-2}$, Theorem 2 can be proved by an easy Fourier-analytic argument, but it is fairly obvious that this argument has no hope of proving the theorem for general set-sizes. Our proof of Theorem 2 is purely combinatorial; the key is to prove a stronger statement by induction on n . Our aim is to do induction on n in the usual way: namely, by choosing some $i \in [n]$ and considering the upper and lower i -sections of $\mathcal{A}$, defined respectively by

$$\mathcal{A}_i^+ = \{A \in \mathcal{P}([n] \setminus \{i\}) : A \cup \{i\} \in \mathcal{A}\}, \quad \mathcal{A}_i^- = \{A \in \mathcal{P}([n] \setminus \{i\}) : A \in \mathcal{A}\}.$$

However, a moment's thought shows that an i -section of an antipodal family need not be antipodal. For example, if $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{S}_{k-1} \cup \overline{\mathcal{S}_{k-1}}$ (the union of a $(k-1)$ -dimensional subcube and its antipode), then for any $i \geq k$, the i -section $\mathcal{A}_i^-$ consists of a single $(k-1)$ -dimensional subcube, which is not an antipodal family. This rules out an inductive hypothesis involving antipodal families.

Hence, we seek a stronger statement (about arbitrary subsets of $\mathcal{P}([n])$), which we can prove by induction on n , and which will imply Theorem 2. It turns out that the right statement is as follows.

Theorem 3. *For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$ with $|\mathcal{A}| \leq 2^{n-1}$,*

$$2e(\mathcal{A}) + |\mathcal{A} \cap \overline{\mathcal{A}}| \leq 2F(|\mathcal{A}|). \quad (2)$$

To see why this implies Theorem 2, assume that Theorem 3 holds, and let $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$ be antipodal with $|\mathcal{A}| \leq 2^{n-1}$. We have $\mathcal{A}_n^- = \overline{\mathcal{A}_n^+}$ and $|\mathcal{A}_n^+| = |\mathcal{A}|/2 \leq 2^{n-2}$, and so

$$\begin{aligned} e(\mathcal{A}) &= e(\mathcal{A}_n^+) + e(\mathcal{A}_n^-) + |\mathcal{A}_n^+ \cap \mathcal{A}_n^-| = e(\mathcal{A}_n^+) + e(\overline{\mathcal{A}_n^+}) + |\mathcal{A}_n^+ \cap \overline{\mathcal{A}_n^+}| \\ &= 2e(\mathcal{A}_n^+) + |\mathcal{A}_n^+ \cap \overline{\mathcal{A}_n^+}| \leq 2F(|\mathcal{A}_n^+|) = 2F(|\mathcal{A}|/2), \end{aligned}$$

implying (1) and so proving Theorem 2.

For any $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$, define

$$f(\mathcal{A}) = 2e(\mathcal{A}) + |\mathcal{A} \cap \overline{\mathcal{A}}|,$$

i.e. f is the function on the left-hand side of (2). Note that f takes the same value (namely, $k2^k$) when $\mathcal{A}$ is a k -dimensional subcube, as when $\mathcal{A}$ is the union of a $(k-1)$ -dimensional subcube and its antipode. This is certainly needed in order for our inductive approach to work, by our above remark about the i -sections of a family consisting of the union of a subcube and its antipode.

We prove Theorem 3 in the next section; in the rest of this section, we gather some additional facts we will use in our proof.

We will use the following lemma of Hart from [4].

Lemma 4. *For any $x, y \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$,*

$$F(x+y) - F(x) - F(y) \geq \min\{x, y\}.$$

Equality holds if y is a power of 2 and $x \leq y$.

We will also use the following easy consequence of Lemma 4.

Lemma 5. *Let $x, y \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x+y \leq 2^n$, $y \geq 2^{n-1}$ and $y \leq 2^{n-1} + x$. Then*

$$F(x+y) - F(y) - F(x) - y + 2^{n-1} \geq x.$$

Proof of Lemma 5. Write $z := y - 2^{n-1}$; then $z \leq x$ and $x+z \leq 2^{n-1}$. We therefore have

$$\begin{aligned} F(x+y) - F(y) - F(x) - y + 2^{n-1} &= F(2^{n-1} + x + z) - F(2^{n-1} + z) - F(x) - z \\ &= F(2^{n-1}) + F(x+z) + x + z \\ &\quad - F(2^{n-1}) - F(z) - z - F(x) - z \\ &= F(x+z) - F(x) - F(z) + x - z \\ &\geq \min\{x, z\} + x - z \\ &= x, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality uses Lemma 4. □

Finally, we note that for any $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
f(\mathcal{A}^c) &= 2e(\mathcal{A}^c) + |\mathcal{A}^c \cap \overline{\mathcal{A}^c}| = n|\mathcal{A}^c| - |\partial(\mathcal{A}^c)| + |\mathcal{A}^c \cap \overline{\mathcal{A}^c}| \\
&= n|\mathcal{A}| + n(|\mathcal{A}^c| - |\mathcal{A}|) - |\partial\mathcal{A}| + |(\mathcal{A} \cup \overline{\mathcal{A}})^c| \\
&= n|\mathcal{A}| - |\partial\mathcal{A}| + n(2^n - 2|\mathcal{A}|) + 2^n - |\mathcal{A} \cup \overline{\mathcal{A}}| \\
&= 2e(\mathcal{A}) + n(2^n - 2|\mathcal{A}|) + 2^n - 2|\mathcal{A}| + |\mathcal{A} \cap \overline{\mathcal{A}}| \\
&= f(\mathcal{A}) + 2(n+1)(2^{n-1} - |\mathcal{A}|),
\end{aligned}$$

so by taking complements, Theorem 3 is equivalent to the following statement: for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$ with $|\mathcal{A}| \geq 2^{n-1}$,

$$f(\mathcal{A}) \leq 2F(|\mathcal{A}|) + 2|\mathcal{A}| - 2^n. \quad (3)$$

2 Proof of Theorem 3

Our proof is by induction on n . The base case $n = 1$ of Theorem 3 is easily checked. We turn to the induction step. Let $n \geq 2$, and assume that Theorem 3 holds when n is replaced by $n - 1$. Let $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$ with $|\mathcal{A}| \leq 2^{n-1}$. We split into three cases.

Case 1. Firstly, suppose that there exists $i \in [n]$ such that $\max\{|\mathcal{A}_i^+|, |\mathcal{A}_i^-|\} \leq 2^{n-2}$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that this holds for $i = n$, i.e. that $\max\{|\mathcal{A}_n^+|, |\mathcal{A}_n^-|\} \leq 2^{n-2}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
f(\mathcal{A}) &= 2e(\mathcal{A}) + |\mathcal{A} \cap \overline{\mathcal{A}}| \\
&= 2e(\mathcal{A}_n^+) + 2e(\mathcal{A}_n^-) + 2|\mathcal{A}_n^+ \cap \mathcal{A}_n^-| + |\mathcal{A}_n^+ \cap \overline{\mathcal{A}_n^-}| + |\mathcal{A}_n^- \cap \overline{\mathcal{A}_n^+}| \\
&= 2e(\mathcal{A}_n^+) + 2e(\mathcal{A}_n^-) + 2|\mathcal{A}_n^+ \cap \mathcal{A}_n^-| + 2|\mathcal{A}_n^+ \cap \overline{\mathcal{A}_n^-}|.
\end{aligned}$$

Defining $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{A}_n^+ \subset \mathcal{P}([n-1])$ and $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{A}_n^- \subset \mathcal{P}([n-1])$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
f(\mathcal{A}) &= 2e(\mathcal{C}) + 2e(\mathcal{D}) + 2|\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{D}| + 2|\mathcal{C} \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}}| \\
&= f(\mathcal{C}) - |\mathcal{C} \cap \overline{\mathcal{C}}| + f(\mathcal{D}) - |\mathcal{D} \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}}| + 2|\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{D}| + 2|\mathcal{C} \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}}| \\
&\leq 2F(|\mathcal{C}|) + 2F(|\mathcal{D}|) + 2|\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{D}| + 2|\mathcal{C} \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}}| - |\mathcal{C} \cap \overline{\mathcal{C}}| - |\mathcal{D} \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}}| \\
&= 2F(|\mathcal{C}| + |\mathcal{D}|) - (2F(|\mathcal{C}| + |\mathcal{D}|) - 2F(|\mathcal{C}|) - 2F(|\mathcal{D}|)) \\
&\quad + 2|\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{D}| + 2|\mathcal{C} \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}}| - |\mathcal{C} \cap \overline{\mathcal{C}}| - |\mathcal{D} \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}}| \\
&\leq 2F(|\mathcal{A}|) + 2|\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{D}| + 2|\mathcal{C} \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}}| - |\mathcal{C} \cap \overline{\mathcal{C}}| - |\mathcal{D} \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}}| - 2\min\{|\mathcal{C}|, |\mathcal{D}|\},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Lemma 4. Hence, it suffices to prove that for any two families $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{P}([n-1])$,

$$2|\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{D}| + 2|\mathcal{C} \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}}| \leq |\mathcal{C} \cap \overline{\mathcal{C}}| + |\mathcal{D} \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}}| + 2\min\{|\mathcal{C}|, |\mathcal{D}|\}. \quad (4)$$

Since (4) is symmetric under interchanging $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$, in proving it we may assume without loss of generality that $|\mathcal{C}| \leq |\mathcal{D}|$. Replacing $n-1$ with n , it suffices to prove the following: for any two families $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$,

$$2|\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{D}| + 2|\mathcal{C} \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}}| \leq |\mathcal{C} \cap \overline{\mathcal{C}}| + |\mathcal{D} \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}}| + 2|\mathcal{C}|. \quad (5)$$

Note that, by inclusion-exclusion, we have

$$2|\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{D}| + 2|\mathcal{C} \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}}| = 2|\mathcal{C} \cap (\mathcal{D} \cup \overline{\mathcal{D}})| + 2|\mathcal{C} \cap (\mathcal{D} \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}})| \leq 2|\mathcal{C}| + 2|\mathcal{C} \cap (\mathcal{D} \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}})|,$$

so it suffices to prove that

$$2|\mathcal{C} \cap (\mathcal{D} \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}})| \leq |\mathcal{C} \cap \overline{\mathcal{C}}| + |\mathcal{D} \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}}|.$$

Writing $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{D} \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}}$, it suffices to prove that for any antipodal set $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$, and any set $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$,

$$2|\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{E}| \leq |\mathcal{C} \cap \overline{\mathcal{C}}| + |\mathcal{E}|.$$

This follows immediately from inclusion-exclusion again; indeed, we have

$$2|\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{E}| = |\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{E}| + |\mathcal{C} \cap \overline{\mathcal{E}}| = |\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{E}| + |\overline{\mathcal{C}} \cap \mathcal{E}| = |(\mathcal{C} \cap \overline{\mathcal{C}}) \cap \mathcal{E}| + |(\mathcal{C} \cup \overline{\mathcal{C}}) \cap \mathcal{E}| \leq |\mathcal{C} \cap \overline{\mathcal{C}}| + |\mathcal{E}|,$$

whenever $\mathcal{E}$ is antipodal.

Case 2. Secondly, suppose that there exists $i \in [n]$ such that

$$2^{n-2} < \max\{|\mathcal{A}_i^+|, |\mathcal{A}_i^-|\} \leq \min\{|\mathcal{A}_i^+|, |\mathcal{A}_i^-|\} + 2^{n-2}.$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume that this holds for $i = n$, and that $|\mathcal{A}_n^+| \geq |\mathcal{A}_n^-|$, so that

$$2^{n-2} < |\mathcal{A}_n^+| \leq 2^{n-2} + |\mathcal{A}_n^-|.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathcal{A}) &= 2e(\mathcal{A}) + |\mathcal{A} \cap \overline{\mathcal{A}}| \\ &= 2e(\mathcal{A}_n^+) + 2e(\mathcal{A}_n^-) + 2|\mathcal{A}_n^+ \cap \mathcal{A}_n^-| + |\mathcal{A}_n^+ \cap \overline{\mathcal{A}_n^-}| + |\mathcal{A}_n^- \cap \overline{\mathcal{A}_n^+}| \\ &= 2e(\mathcal{A}_n^+) + 2e(\mathcal{A}_n^-) + 2|\mathcal{A}_n^+ \cap \mathcal{A}_n^-| + 2|\mathcal{A}_n^+ \cap \overline{\mathcal{A}_n^-}|. \end{aligned}$$

Defining $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{A}_n^+ \subset \mathcal{P}([n-1])$ and $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{A}_n^- \subset \mathcal{P}([n-1])$ as before, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathcal{A}) &= 2e(\mathcal{C}) + 2e(\mathcal{D}) + 2|\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{D}| + 2|\mathcal{C} \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}}| \\ &= f(\mathcal{C}) - |\mathcal{C} \cap \overline{\mathcal{C}}| + f(\mathcal{D}) - |\mathcal{D} \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}}| + 2|\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{D}| + 2|\mathcal{C} \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}}| \\ &\leq 2F(|\mathcal{C}|) + 2|\mathcal{C}| - 2^{n-1} + 2F(|\mathcal{D}|) + 2|\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{D}| + 2|\mathcal{C} \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}}| - |\mathcal{C} \cap \overline{\mathcal{C}}| - |\mathcal{D} \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}}| \\ &= 2F(|\mathcal{C}| + |\mathcal{D}|) - (2F(|\mathcal{C}| + |\mathcal{D}|) - 2F(|\mathcal{C}|) - 2F(|\mathcal{D}|) - 2|\mathcal{C}| + 2 \cdot 2^{n-2}) \\ &\quad + 2|\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{D}| + 2|\mathcal{C} \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}}| - |\mathcal{C} \cap \overline{\mathcal{C}}| - |\mathcal{D} \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}}| \\ &\leq 2F(|\mathcal{A}|) + 2|\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{D}| + 2|\mathcal{C} \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}}| - |\mathcal{C} \cap \overline{\mathcal{C}}| - |\mathcal{D} \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}}| - 2|\mathcal{D}|, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality uses Lemma 5, applied with $x = |\mathcal{D}|$ and $y = |\mathcal{C}|$, and with $n - 1$ in place of n . Hence, it suffices to prove that for any two families $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{P}([n - 1])$,

$$2|\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{D}| + 2|\mathcal{C} \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}}| \leq |\mathcal{C} \cap \overline{\mathcal{C}}| + |\mathcal{D} \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}}| + 2|\mathcal{D}|.$$

Interchanging $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ and replacing $n - 1$ with n , it suffices to prove that for any two families $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$,

$$2|\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{D}| + 2|\mathcal{C} \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}}| \leq |\mathcal{C} \cap \overline{\mathcal{C}}| + |\mathcal{D} \cap \overline{\mathcal{D}}| + 2|\mathcal{C}|,$$

and this is precisely the inequality (5), so we are done.

Case 3. The third and final case is that we have

$$\max\{|\mathcal{A}_i^+|, |\mathcal{A}_i^-|\} \geq \min\{|\mathcal{A}_i^+|, |\mathcal{A}_i^-|\} + 2^{n-2} + 1 \quad \forall i \in [n].$$

In this case, we have

$$|\partial\mathcal{A}| = \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{A}_i^+ \Delta \mathcal{A}_i^-| \geq n(2^{n-2} + 1),$$

and therefore, crudely,

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathcal{A}) &= 2e(\mathcal{A}) + |\mathcal{A} \cap \overline{\mathcal{A}}| = n|\mathcal{A}| - |\partial\mathcal{A}| + |\mathcal{A} \cap \overline{\mathcal{A}}| \leq n|\mathcal{A}| - |\partial\mathcal{A}| + |\mathcal{A}| \\ &\leq n(|\mathcal{A}| - 2^{n-2} - 1) + |\mathcal{A}| = (n + 1)|\mathcal{A}| - n(2^{n-2} + 1). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, to complete the proof of Theorem 3, it suffices to prove that

$$(n + 1)k - n(2^{n-2} + 1) \leq 2F(k) \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N} : 2^{n-2} < k \leq 2^{n-1}. \quad (6)$$

Write $k = 2^{n-2} + m$, where $1 \leq m \leq 2^{n-2}$. Then by Lemma 4, we have

$$F(k) = F(2^{n-2} + m) = F(2^{n-2}) + F(m) + m = (n - 2)2^{n-3} + F(m) + m,$$

so (6) reduces to

$$(n + 1)(2^{n-2} + m) - n(2^{n-2} + 1) \leq (n - 2)2^{n-2} + 2F(m) + 2m \quad \forall m \in \mathbb{N} : m \leq 2^{n-2},$$

i.e.

$$(n - 1)m \leq (n - 3)2^{n-2} + 2F(m) + n \quad \forall m \in \mathbb{N} : m \leq 2^{n-2}. \quad (7)$$

This is easily verified. Indeed, for $n = 2$, the constraint on m implies that $m = 1$, and equality holds in (7) when $n = 2$ and $m = 1$. For $n = 3$, the constraint on m implies that $m = 1$ or $m = 2$, and (7) holds in both cases. We may assume therefore that $n \geq 4$. In this case, (7) is easily verified for $m \leq 3$; when $m \geq 4$, we have $F(m) \geq m$, so we have

$$(n - 1)m = (n - 3)m + 2m \leq (n - 3)2^{n-2} + 2F(m) < (n - 3)2^{n-2} + 2F(m) + n,$$

completing the proof of (7), and so proving Theorem 3. $\square$

Interestingly, it turns out that in fact Case 3 cannot occur. This is an easy consequence of the following lemma, which we prove using a short Fourier-analytic argument.

Lemma 6. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$, and let $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$ with $|\mathcal{A}| = \alpha 2^n$. Then there exists $i \in [n]$ such that

$$\frac{||\mathcal{A}_i^+| - |\mathcal{A}_i^-||}{2^n} \leq \sqrt{\frac{\alpha - \alpha^2}{n}}. \quad (8)$$

Proof of Lemma 6. Let $g : \mathcal{P}([n]) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ denote the indicator function of $\mathcal{A}$. For each $S \subset [n]$, let

$$\hat{g}(S) = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{A \subset [n]} (-1)^{|A \cap S|} g(A)$$

denote the Fourier coefficient of g at S . Note that the left-hand side of (8) is precisely $|\hat{g}(\{i\})|$. By Parseval's identity, we have

$$\sum_{S \subset [n]} \hat{g}(S)^2 = \|g\|_2^2 = \alpha,$$

where $\|g\|_2 = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{A \subset [n]} g(A)}$. We also have $\hat{g}(\emptyset) = \alpha$, and therefore

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \hat{g}(\{i\})^2 \leq \sum_{\substack{S \subset [n]: \\ S \neq \emptyset}} \hat{g}(S)^2 = \alpha - \alpha^2.$$

Hence, by averaging, there exists $i \in [n]$ such that $\hat{g}(\{i\})^2 \leq \frac{\alpha - \alpha^2}{n}$, proving the lemma. $\square$

Now suppose for a contradiction that Case 3 occurs for some family $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$. Then

$$\frac{||\mathcal{A}_i^+| - |\mathcal{A}_i^-||}{2^n} > \frac{1}{4} \quad \forall i \in [n].$$

Let $\alpha = |\mathcal{A}|/2^n$. By Lemma 6, and since $\alpha - \alpha^2$ is maximized at $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$, we have

$$\frac{1}{4} < \min_{i \in [n]} \left(\frac{||\mathcal{A}_i^+| - |\mathcal{A}_i^-||}{2^n} \right) \leq \sqrt{\frac{\alpha - \alpha^2}{n}} \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{n}},$$

so $n < 4$. But for $n = 2$ and $n = 3$ it is easily checked that there exists no family $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$ such that Case 3 occurs — a contradiction, as desired.

References

- [1] A. J. Bernstein, Maximally connected arrays on the n -cube, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **15** (1967), 1485–1489.
- [2] Y. D. Burago and V. A. Zalgaller, *Geometric inequalities*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin (1988).

- [3] L. H. Harper, Optimal assignment of numbers to vertices, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, **12** (1964), 131–135.
- [4] S. Hart, A note on the edges of the n -cube, *Discrete Math.* **14** (1976), pp 157–161.
- [5] J. H. Lindsey II, Assignment of numbers to vertices, *Amer. Math. Monthly* **71** (1964), 508–516.
- [6] R. Osserman, The isoperimetric inequality, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **84** (1978), 1182–1238.
- [7] M. Ritoré and A. Ros, Stable mean constant curvature tori and the isoperimetric problem in three space forms, *Comment. Math. Helvet.* **67** (1992), 293–305.
- [8] A. Ros, *The Isoperimetric Problem*, Lecture notes from the Clay Mathematics Institute Summer School on the Global Theory of Minimal Surfaces, June–July 2001, Mathematical Sciences Research Institute, Berkeley, California. Available at <http://www.ugr.es/~aros/isoper.pdf>.